REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 18, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 18, 2003. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-49 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 8-50 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 7 and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice and re-presented in independent form as claim 50 and claim 51, respectively. Applicants submit that the new claims do not introduce new matter and are commensurate in scope with their cancelled counterparts. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the new claims are entitled to a full range of equivalents for each of the recited elements.

Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Bakuya et al.* (hereinafter *Bakuya*, US 5,680,614). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Bakuya discloses a relational database management system with trigger definition means that define the contents of a triggered operation based on reference constraints given among a plurality of tables defined in the database. The Examiner suggests that the claimed type value that indicates whether a trigger definition is self-referencing or not is taught by *Bakuya*. Applicants respectfully point out that the reference constraints defined in *Bakuya* are constraints given for a plurality of tables that determine whether the trigger operation should be processed or an exception should be generated. In *Bakuya* the trigger execution means processes the trigger operation based on the reference constraints defined by the trigger definition means and executes exception generation when the update request is against the reference constraints. A self-referencing trigger is however, one wherein the table the trigger is created on is also referenced in the body of the trigger definition. The reference constraints given in *Bakuya* are conditions set on the operation of the triggers and do not in any way teach, show, or suggest a trigger created on a table which is also referred to in the trigger body.

Furthermore, the Examiner suggests that *Bakuya* teaches a method of maintaining system integrity in a database comprising a plurality of triggers defined on at least one of a plurality of objects comprising receiving an I/O event that affects an object; determining whether a trigger defined on the object is self-referencing, and making the trigger inoperative. Applicants respectfully point out that *Bakuya* is not directed to maintaining system integrity, but simplifying the processing for a system directory management and enabling customization of the database system for resource manipulation. Because trigger definition information in *Bakuya* does not contain any information regarding self-referencing triggers, *Bakuya* can not teach, show, or suggest a system that determines whether a trigger defined on an object is self-referencing. Accordingly, *Bakuya* does not teach or show a method that comprises making a trigger inoperative when the system receives an event that affects an object with a self-referencing trigger defined on it.

The Examiner then suggests that the claimed element of determining whether the object has a dependency relationship with at least one trigger of the plurality of triggers is taught by *Bakuya* at column 10, lines 29-34. The Applicants were unable to find any support for the Examiner's assertion that the claimed subject matter is disclosed by the cited passage. The passage shows examples of trigger definitions generated based on reference constraints. The constraint set in FIG. 10A specifies that the "Assignment" column of the "Employee" table refers to the "Section number" column of the "Section" table and in this way limits the values at the "Assignment" column to those included in the group of values at the "Section number". The other examples illustrate similar operations. These examples do not in any way teach, show, or suggest a method of determining whether an object that is being affected by an I/O event has a dependency relationship with any trigger of the plurality of triggers.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable and allowance of the same is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 7 and 23 have been

canceled and rewritten in independent form (as claims 50 and 51, respectively) and are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the method or apparatus of the present invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)

ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES

400

TDE

GENERAL TRIGGER DEFINITION INFORMATION HEADER STATUS - OPERATIVE SELF - REFERENCING ATTRIBUTE	402
TRIGGER NAME - - - LIB1/TRIG1	404
DEPENDENT OBJECT AREA INFORMATION DATA FOR TABLE 1 : OBJOFF OBJLEN LIBOFF LIBLEN DATA FOR TABLE 2 : OBJOFF OBJLEN LIBOFF LIBLEN DATA FOR TABLE 3 : OBJOFF OBJLEN LIBOFF LIBLEN	406
SANITIZED CREATE TRIGGER STATEMENT AREA CREATE TRIGGER LIB1 . TRIG1 AFTER UPDATE OF COL1 , COL2 , COL3 ON LIB1. TABLE1 REFERENCING OLD AS X1 NEW AS X2 FOR EACH ROW MODE DB2SQL WHEN (X1 . COL1 = 1) BEGIN ATOMIC INSERT INTO LIB1 . TABLE1 (COL1 , COL2 , COL3) VALUES (1 , 2 , 3) ; INSERT INTO LIB1 . TABLE2 (COL1 , COL2 , COL3) VALUES (4 , 5 , 6) ; INSERT INTO LIB2 . TABLE3 (COL1 , COL2 , COL3) VALUES (7 , 8 , 9) ; END	408

LEGEND:

OBJOFF - Offset into the ~~Create~~ Create Trigger statement to the object name
OBJLEN - Length of the object name in the Create Trigger statement
LIBOFF - Offset to the library name associated with the object name in the Create Trigger statement
LIBLEN - Length of the library name in the Create Trigger statement

Fig. 4